



RECEIVED

OCT 03 2003

TC 1700

REMARKS

The Action, mailed March 26, 2003, the prior art cited and the various requirements and rejections have been carefully considered and it is believed that this response places the application in condition for allowance.

The requirement for a shorter abstract has been complied with by submitting a new abstract. Formal drawings that had been required are included with this response.

Claims 1-20 are in the application. Claims 4, 6, 7 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 16, 18 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Woodson et al. Claims 10-15 have been allowed. Claims 3, 5, 8, 17 and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 4 has been amended to set forth that at least one vertical mounting strip is positioned on the outer surface of the screen and aligned with the at least one vertical deflecting strip, with fasteners extending through the screen and strips to attach the strips to the screen. It is believed that this amendment to claim 4 overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112(b).

Claim 6 has been amended to clarify that the additional vertical deflecting strips are supported from the screen and positioned along the interior surface of the screen in circumferentially spaced relation. This amendment is believed to provide basis for "additional" vertical deflecting strips.

Claim 7 has been amended to set forth that the at least one vertical deflecting strip includes an elongated vertical flange supported between radially outwardly extending vertical side edge flanges on the screen which are bolted together. This amendment is believed to clearly claim the structure illustrated in Figure 8 of the drawings.

Claim 20 has been amended to clearly define that the flange on the at least one elongated deflecting strip is clamped between radially outwardly extending vertical side edge flanges on the screen which are bolted together to form the screen or screen sections. This amendment is believed to avoid the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection of claim 20.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 16 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Woodson et al. with attention being directed to column 3, line 54, to column 4, line 11. The Woodson patent does not disclose any deflecting strips supported from the screen and along the interior surface of the screen. In the Woodson patent, the screen 14 includes semi-cylindrical components 40 and 42 which are connected at one edge

by a vertical hinge 44 and at the other edge by overcenter latches 46. The structure described in column 3, line 54, to column 4, line 11 of Woodson relates to the rotor structure that includes a shaft 60, support hub 72, support arms 74 and plates 76 secured to the arms 74 by fastening devices 78. Extending between plates 76 is a plurality of blades 80 which are inclined from a leading edge to a trailing edge and provided with a curved outer edge 84 to correspond with the inner surface of the screen 14. There is no deflecting strip supported from the screen and positioned along the interior surface of the screen in Woodson as recited in those claims which have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

In Woodson, the screen configuration is clearly illustrated in Figure 4 which is a sectional view taken along section line 4-4 in Figure 3. Figures 3 and 4 in Woodson disclose the rotor including the shaft 60 with hubs 72 mounted on the shaft with each hub including radially extending arms 74, as clearly illustrated in Figures 3 and 5. The inclined blades 80 are also clearly illustrated in Figures 3 and 5 with the blades 80 extending between and attached to the plates 76. Thus, the rotor in Woodson includes shaft 60, hubs 72, arms 74, plates 76 and blades 80 all of which rotate within the interior of the screen 14 and adjacent the interior surface of the screen. The screen 14 in Woodson does not include a deflecting strip or

strips that are supported from the screen and does not include any deflecting strips with inclined edges or surfaces in opposed relation to the direction or movement of the pellets or particles to deflect the pellets or particles back toward the rotor as claimed. Accordingly, the rejection claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 16, 18 and 20 as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is not supported by the disclosure in the Woodson patent. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of these claims is requested.

Applicants submit that the requirement regarding the drawings and abstract have been complied with and that the rejection of certain claims under 35 U.S.C. §112(b) has been avoided and that the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) are not anticipated by the Woodson patent. As such, early issuance of a Notice of Allowance in this application is now appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC

By: Harvey B. Jacobson, Jr. *Ref. No.*
for *17,393*
Harvey B. Jacobson, Jr.
Reg. No. 20,851

400 Seventh Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 638-6666
Atty. Dkt. No.: P66814US0
HBJ/HAS/vss
Date: September 25, 2003